

The title has been amended to obviate the Examiner's objection to the title. Claims 30-36 have been added. As a result, claims 1-36 are currently pending in the patent application.

The image file format of Figure 3 is not prior art, as indicated by the Examiner. Figure 3 shows an image file format in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention, as indicated in the specification. That is, in one embodiment, the camera 202 generates an image file that comprises a first portion having profile information 300 and a second portion having image data 302 (e.g., image captured by the camera 202). As such, the image file is not prior art since it comprises more than just the "International Color Consortium's profile format." The format of the image file of Figure 3 comprises an image data 302 along with profile information 300, in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. Furthermore, the profile information 300 is not limited to the International Color Consortium Profile format.

Claim 1 calls for a method that comprises receiving a graphical object having associated profile information and generating a profile based on the associated profile information. The method further comprises identifying the profile to a color management system. Although not so limited, in one embodiment, the graphical object may be an image from a camera, for example.

Edge describes a method of mapping colors between color imaging systems. Column 1, lines 7-9. The color mapping method includes mapping between source and destination color imaging systems by using profiles that characterize the color imaging systems to generate device-independent color values for the source color imaging system and to convert to device-dependent values of the destination color imaging system by performing a color conversion using the profiles. Column 2, lines 23-30.

Edge does not teach one or more claimed elements called for by claim 1. For example, claim 1 calls for receiving *a graphical object* having associated profile information. In one embodiment, the associated profile information may contain, for

example, attributes such as measurement and illuminant tags that may be unique to the received graphical object. Edge, in contrast, simply teaches mapping colors between different devices, and, as such, does not teach mapping color based on receiving profile information associated with a graphical object. For this reason alone, claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Claim 7 calls for a program storage device, readable by a device, comprising instructions stored thereon for causing the device to receive a graphical object having associated profile information, generate a profile based on the associated profile information, and identify the profile to a color management system. Edge at least does not teach a device to receive a graphical object having associated profile information and then to generate a profile based on the associated profile information. Again, Edge describes a method for color mapping between devices, and does not teach generating the profile based on profile information associated with a graphical object. For this reason alone, claim 7, and its dependent claims, are allowable.

With respect to claim 14, Edge does not teach or suggest a device to capture a graphical object, the graphical object having a profile information portion and a data portion. For at least this reason, claim 14 and its dependent claims are allowable.

In addition to missing elements presented above, the Office Action contains several other deficiencies. For example, claims 2 and 10 call for associating a filename with the profile, an element that is not disclosed in Edge. As an additional example, claims 2 and 9 call for storing profile information in a profile file, an element that is once again not taught or suggested by Edge. In view of the arguments presented above, other noted deficiencies in the Office Action are believed to be moot.

In light of the aforementioned arguments, all of the pending claims are allowable. Additionally, newly added claims are also allowable over the cited references, in light of some of the arguments presented above. Arguments pertaining to selected dependent claims have been noted. However, to the extent that characterizations of prior art

references or Applicants' claimed subject matter are not specifically addressed, it is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to such characterizations.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 22-29 are allowable. In his reasons for allowance, the Examiner indicates that a current profile information part is sent to a color management system (see last two lines on page 4 of the Office Action) [emphasis added]. The Applicants would like to clarify that the independent claim 22 merely calls for identifying (as opposed to sending) current profile information part to a color management module (CMM). As such, claim 22 does not necessarily require that the current profile information part (CPI) be actually sent to the CMM, but only that it be somehow identified to the CMM.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.16, a check in the amount of \$286.00 is enclosed, which is the filing fee for the additional claims. No additional fees are believed to be required due to this response. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (INTL-0055-US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/26/01



Ruben S. Bains
Reg. No. 46,532
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]